DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 033 675 HE 001 213

TITLE Statement cn Student-Faculty-Administrative Relaticnsnips.

INSTITUTICN National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C.

Pub Date Nov 69

Note 43p.; A Report to the Senate and member instituticns of the National Association cf State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Chicago, Ill., November 12, 1969.

EDRS Price EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.25

Descriptors *Administraticn, Administrative Change, *Administrative Policy, Administrator Attitudes, Faculty, *Governance, *Higher Educaticn, *Models, Student Participation

Abstract

In the fall of 1968, President Fred Harvey Harrington of the University of Wisconsin and NASULGC appcinted a committee on student-faculty-administrative relationships. Its charge was to produce a statement that would help guide universities in involving students and faculty in meaningful ways in governance. The report that emerged dces not cffer specific prescriptions but rather "insights into governance problems which can be garnered frcm an appreciation of history, of organizaticnal theory, and of experiments in cther institutions." It discusses the develcpment of contemporary administrative relaticnships, the theoretical and practical implications of (including obstacles to) changes in governance, and 3 models of college/university gcvernment that have recently ccme into practice: the academic community, the independent constituency, and the city ccuncil. It is the intention of this committee to follow this general report with anctner one examining in clcser detail some specific examples of college/university government. (JS)

STATEMENT ON STUDENT–FACULTY–ADMINISTRATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

A Report to the Senate and Member Institutions
of the
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES
AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES
by the
Committee on
Student-Faculty Administrative Relationship

NOVEMBER 1969

A NOTE ABOUT THE REPORT

The report which follows was presented to the Senate of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges on November 12, 1969, by President Robben W. Fleming, University of Michigan, Chairman of the Committee on Student-Faculty Administrative Relationships.

The report, as the authors make clear, does not offer "specific prescriptions" but rather "insights into governance problems which can be garnered from an appreciation of history, of organizational theory, and of experiments in other institutions" and is therefore not a formal policy statement of the Association. The Committee was assisted in background research and writing by Mr. David Dill, a graduate student in the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Michigan.

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges is an organization of 113 major state and land-grant universities and colleges, with members in all states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

In the fall of 1968, the new President of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Fred Harvey Harrington of Wisconsin, appointed a committee on the subject of Student-Faculty-Administrative Relationships. The committee's charge was to produce a statement that would, in President Harrington's words, "give all our universities some guidelines that will help them involve both students and faculties in meaningful ways." The statement following constitutes the committee's reply to that charge.

Early in their discussions the members of the committee concurred that no single system of student-faculty-administrative relationships, i.e., governance pattern, existed which all universities could or should adopt, rather each institution would need to develop a system in keeping with its specific problems, purposes and traditions. This report therefore offers no specific prescriptions. But recognizing that each institution might pursue a similar pattern of assessment and experimentation, the committee has attempted to offer those insights into governance problems which can be garnered from an appreciation of history, of organizational theory, and of experiments in other institutions.

Members of the committee are: Robben W. Fleming, President, University of Michigan, Chairman; Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., President, University of Connecticut; Mark Barlow, Jr., Vice President for Student Affairs, Cornell University; Jack W. Peltason, Chancellor, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign Campus; Charles Smith, Professor of Sociology, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University; Charles E. Young, Chancellor, University of California, Los Angeles Campus.

FOREWORD

It has been almost ten years since the first black students sat-in at a lunch counter in Greensboro, North Carolina, and drew attention to modern student protest. During the early part of the decade student activism spread to the large universities of the north and the incidence of student protest greatly increased. But with the Berkeley student movement of 1964 the focus shifted from off-campus issues to those within the university community. As protests developed concerning the student's rights as a citizen in the academic community, the relationship of the university to the war in Vietnam, and more recently to the admission and education of minority-group students, tension on university campuses has continually mounted and often erupted into turmoil.

While the existence of conflict in the university community may, if properly managed, contribute to the health of a university, particularly after so long a period of student apathy and noninvolvement, the occurrence of physical disruptions and the concomitant growth in public concern have led many members of the university to seek more constructive means of settling disputes. Increasingly, attention has been drawn to the governance patterns of colleges and universities.

As a direct result of the felt inadequacies of current governance models many universities have established comprehensive committees to examine and restructure their governance system. The purpose of this report is to provide perspective for institutional self-assessments. Recognizing that each institution must evaluate and restructure its own community with attention to its unique history, needs, and purposes, no attempt has been made to prescribe or impose. It is hoped that a fuller understanding of the problem, of its depth and of its breadth, will allow the explorations on individual campuses to be more sensitive, and perhaps more fruitful.

While the immediate and necessary goal of this committee is to concentrate on the important problem of governance, the university community must be warned against the prevailing tendency to look upon the restructuring of governance as a panacea. It is the belief of this committee that both our society and its universities are at a critical stage; that their future depends on the flexibility they show in adjusting to change. As has been indicated, one of these changes is in the area of governance, but it is probably not the most difficult change and it will most certainly not be sufficient. For much of the turmoil on the contemporary campus results from a moral attack on the society and on the philosophical bases of the American academic community. The political restructuring of the university may temper but will not end this turmoil. Unless there is a sincere dedication to these issues as well as to the necessary problem of governance, the university will degenerate.

Many of the tensions and stresses in contemporary higher education appear to be related to priorities, goals or essential values underlying our society. Critics point out, for example, that the trust and faith of Americans in their social system is low, and that racial inequality, the war in Vietnam, black ghettos and the great disparity between wealth and poverty in the United States are at odds with the ideals of our democracy.

Because the vast majority of funds expended on higher education in this society are public funds, and because such funds support both the private and the public universities which provide the trained personnel, research, and services the society needs, universities are viewed as inextricably involved with the larger society. Therefore, the loss of legitimacy of the society contributes to the loss of legitimacy of the university. Increasingly members of the university community realize that its legitimacy will be difficult to restore until the priorities of the larger

society become more humane and equitable. Recognizing the seriousness of the situation, many prominent university leaders have spoken out on the need to change societal priorities.

In addition to the need to respond to the moral attacks being made on the society, the university must come to grips with the challenges being made to its philosophical bases. Sincere members of the academic community are asking quite profound questions about the modern university. What for example should be its basic mission in contemporary society?

Some ask whether its daily operations--hiring, training, spending, investing--as well as its teaching and research functions should not be dedicated to social change, to the betterment of minority groups, improvement of the environment, and development of new social and political forms.

Other members of the academic community are challenging the ideal of reason upon which the university is based. Arguing that detachment and the dispassionate pursuit of knowledge have failed us, they have proposed an infusion into the university of the subjective, the affective, and the emotional. Some of the strongest attacks on the university are being made from this position. The attack is most obvious in our society, itself, which symbolizes the Age of Reason. Increasingly one is aware of an Age of Feeling, an affective response and repudiation of the supposedly rational traits of restraint, objectivity, and efficiency. Within our universities this reaction is represented by the demands for relevance in the curriculum, the extracurricular involvement in psychedelic drugs, more subjective forms of religious experience, and the visceral world of demonstration and confrontation. The charges are made that pure reason must be reunited with feeling; that the universities have concentrated on pragmatic or instrumental reason, ignoring or excluding normative reason--the criticism of social reality in accordance with principles of right and order. The existence of

this dichotomy it is said has led to a university based on errant rationalism which produces "men of genius who are not also men of character."

These two challenges, to the nature of reason and to the mission of the university, are but two of many significant questions being raised concerning the philosophical bases of the university. They should not be ignored. The university of the future lies in the dialogue to be carried out in the present over just such issues as these.

Some have argued in response to these challenges that a discipline of education must be developed to serve as the queen of all disciplines within the university, and that such a discipline would guide universities as to their proper function and structure and would serve to unify the community on basic principles. Others have argued that each of the components of the university needs a renewal of vision: undergraduate education should be oriented towards developmental needs of the student; graduate training and research should become more relevant to human concerns; the service function must be renewed with a goal as socially significant as the original land-grant concept. Such renewals of vision are in keeping with the university's great tradition of continually seeking for new visions of the truth, and in so doing, winning students to the pursuit of truth. Such new visions are desperately needed today.

The focus of this report is on the immediate and pressing concern of reform in student-faculty-administrative relationships. And yet for the university to face adequately its present crisis it must also dedicate itself to a careful consideration of our societal priorities and to a renewal of vision in each of the component parts of the institution. For the American university cannot maintain its preeminent position if those who should be visionary educators fail to see at least as far as those who wish to learn.

PART I

PRELUDE TO CONTEMPORARY GOVERNANCE SYSTEM

A. Historical Background

There are those who say that everything now wrong with the university has been wrong with it for at least fifty years, the difference being that until recently no one cared. For this reason, a necessary part of any statement on contemporary university governance is an analysis of the historical developments which contributed to these governance patterns.

The Authoritarian University

The history of governance in American colleges and universities illustrates the gradual democratization of an authoritarian structure, as different members of the academic community rose to legitimacy and authority. Authoritarian, in this context, connotes a concentration of authority and influence with a few, notably the president and the board of control, with the expectation of obedience from the other members of the academic community, i.e., faculty and students. Democratization has been neither constant nor universal. Some argue that contemporary faculties are losing influence and authority rather than maintaining or improving it. Furthermore, research suggests that many current institutions still retain essentially authoritarian governance patterns.

The authoritarian structure of colonial colleges, which has so influenced our present governance patterns, was essentially an American creation. While it is undoubtedly true that all universities have been agents of the state in which they existed, in that they indoctrinated students with the socially accepted reality of the time, the

earliest American College--Harvard--was more clearly in this mold than were Cambridge or Oxford, Paris or Bologna. The latter universities were originally established by bands of professional scholars and students, which then sought the approval of the state. The colony of Massachusetts, on the other hand, created Harvard to preserve the existing culture, to serve as a podium for theological discussion, and to train literate clergy.

Both the emphasis on discipline and the courses of instruction supported the aim of obedience to authority. The curriculum was the same for all and the method of teaching was directly traceable to scholasticism. But in addition to the classroom experience, the student's social and physical life was molded by religious observation, attention to right conduct, and absolute supervision over dress and physical appearance. Academic government in this setting pertained to rigorous control, what is known as in loco parentis, and until the early eighteenth century discipline was maintained by flogging. While this type of control over students differed markedly from continental universities, it was not significantly different, except perhaps in zeal, from the English colleges after which Harvard was modeled. What was different, and what made the early American colleges more distinctively authoritarian than even their British counterparts was the existence of governing boards.

Unlike the continental and English universities, which were founded as self-governing guilds of masters, the early American universities were founded by non-teaching boards. Harvard was organized by a Board of Overseers consisting of clergy in 1637. Copying the English model, a self-governing entity called the corporation and consisting of tutors and the president, was established in 1650. This pattern was also followed at William and Mary; however within a hundred years both Harvard and William and Mary had external and internal boards made up of nonacademics with the power to make ultimate decisions regarding the colleges. This

radical change from the continental and English models occurred for a variety of reasons, but certainly among them were: the lack of an older, established class of professional teachers at the time of the founding; the desire of the clerical founders for a retention of orthodoxy; and a proprietary concern of the founders with their creation. Yale, for example, was founded with only one board which desired to maintain the tightest of controls--they were determined not to make the mistakes of Harvard. Not only were Harvard and William and Mary to lose their academic governing boards over time, but the vast majority of colleges founded after Yale followed its structure of a single, external governing board.

In addition to losing the powers of control characteristic of European universities, the faculty of American colleges were treated like their students. Their behavior was rigorously controlled from above, while religious tests and the signing of oaths were required to prove religious orthodoxy. In turn, their behavior toward students reflected their role as hired disciplinarians. They viewed students as essentially depraved human beings requiring primitive punishments for control and a significant part of their time was spent literally in chasing down the students and administering punishment.

The Growth of Faculty Influence

The lowly position of faculty members in the college and university hierarchy continued throughout the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Indeed, as the size and complexity of American institutions of higher education grew, further power seemed to flow into the hands of the presidents and boards of control. This growth in power did not go unchallenged. Although the bulk of faculty members were timid and conformist to authority from above,

protests were continually made; the earliest reformers demanded a return to the faculty-governed university found in Europe. More realistically, many requested that faculty members be permitted to participate in the decision-making process with the board and the president. Such a procedure was informally established at Yale in the early nineteenth century by President Jeremiah Day, who consistently consulted his faculty on important policy decisions.

The greatest force for the development of faculty influence was the general movement during the middle of the nineteenth century fostering science and the German university ideal in American higher education. Motivated by their experiences abroad, many faculty campaigned for the pursuit of scientific truth through experimentation and research as opposed to the acceptance of revealed truth. The first significant impact of this movement occurred when scientific schools were instituted in affiliation with existing colleges. But with the founding of Johns Hopkins University in 1876, the ideal of the faculty-centered institution came much closer to reality on the American scene. Hopkins provided the college teacher with the apparatus, salaries, and most importantly the spirit to form a new professional class--the American scholar. With the passage of the Hatch Act of 1887 governmental assistance was provided for research in land-grant institutions, thereby broadening the opportunities for would-be scholars. As the numbers pursuing the scholarly life increased, knowledge and the universities grew apace, resulting in the development of academic hierarchies, and most significantly, the reorganization of knowledge by discipline-oriented departments.

While this professionalization of faculty and the accompanying growth of organization led to some increase in status and authority, it is

debatable whether faculty really developed significant influence in university decision making during this period. As long as boards of control and presidents continued to look upon the faculty as employees who could be fired on whim, it would be difficult for faculty to expand their legitimate authority beyond the traditional areas of curriculum and research.

As the twentieth century opened, the academic freedom of the university professor was still not fully established. Many prominent academicians were dismissed from their posts because their views angered members of the boards of control. As a consequence, the American Association of University Professors was founded in 1915 to promote and protect academic freedom and tenure. The development of a professional interest group with specific recommendations and the power to investigate and "blacklist" institutions led to an increase of real influence for faculty members on their individual campuses. With the powerful force of the AAUP behind them faculty were able to negotiate for, and receive, job tenure, salary schedules, rules governing appointments, commitment to the principles of academic freedom and a general clarification of job function. As faculty senates were established at many institutions, the Association also pressed for faculty participation in decision making, and universities such as Cornell, Michigan, Illinois and California responded by establishing means of increased contact between their faculties and boards of control.

As already suggested, however, faculty influence in the decision-making process has not taken a positive rise, historically. Rather their influence has tended to oscillate. The tutors at early Harvard and William and Mary, for example, were represented on the boards of control, but over time these tutors were displaced as the president and nonacademic members of the board assumed greater power. With the professionalization of the faculty and the founding of the AAUP, faculty influence rose again. However, the still remaining demands for the formation of faculty senates and the growth of faculty

unions indicate that the authority of faculty has not been universally accepted as yet. Furthermore, recent statements and documents issued by professional organizations, and by faculty committees at individual institutions, suggest the influence of faculty in decision making is declining due to the rapid growth of higher education, the disinterest of many faculty members, and the resulting tendency to centralize authority above the faculty. Nonetheless, the history of academic governance reveals that the faculty has developed a significant amount of authority and a legitimate right to participate in the decision-making process.

The Growth of Alumni Influence

Generally ignored in discussions of university governance, alumni of American colleges and universities have gradually developed influence and like the faculty have achieved some legitimacy in the decision-making process. The earliest influence of alumni came as part of the faculty itself which during the period of the colonial colleges was largely recruited from recent graduates of an institution. However, as alumni associations formed in the early nineteenth century to aid alumni in reliving their undergraduate days, and as faculties became less parochial, the alumni's burgeoning desire to support alma mater conflicted with their decreasing opportunity to influence her.

The opportunity for alumni to exert their influence on the affairs of the institution came in two developments which rapidly followed each other. The first involved the "private" colleges and universities which attempted after the Civil War to rid themselves of clerical influences on their boards of control and at the same time to replace the loss of public funds, now going to "public" institutions. The combined solution to these problems was to pursue avidly the financial resources of alumni and to replace public and

clerical members of the board with alumni-elected trustees. These actions both enhanced the self-image of the alumni and legitimized their role in institutional decision making. The second development involved both public and private universities alike. It was the involvement of alumni in the extracurricula, particularly athletics. The interest of undergraduates in athletics arose in the middle 1800's and was received with massive apathy on the part of faculty and administration alike. The needs of capital and coaching, particularly in the team sports of baseball, crew and football were soon supplied by interested alumni who eventually came to hold important positions on policy and decision-making boards related to the extracurricula.

Thus alumni have come to wield significant influence over their alma maters through boards of control, legitimate authority in the extracurricula, and by monetary allocations for certain projects. Such influence has always been a mystery to European visitors where alumni traditionally have little influence.

The Growth of Student Influence

While the participation of faculty and alumni in decision making has been relatively legitimized over time, it now falls to the contemporary university to wrestle over the legitimacy of student involvement.

The authoritative work on student influence in higher education has yet to be written; still it seems reasonable to argue that their influence on the enterprise has been both neglected and underestimated. Historically, students have influenced their institutions by every means, from physical labor to riot, along the way affecting the curriculum, and to a significant extent creating the extracurriculum. They have been quick to respond to

a lack of relevancy in their studies, creating the literary societies in the eighteenth century as a reaction to the aridity of the classical curriculum, and developing athletics in the nineteenth century in response to the faculties' increasing concentration on research and scholarship. Frederick Rudolph, a noted historian of higher education, has described the college student as the most creative and imaginative force in the shaping of the American college and university. The following analysis owes much to his insights.

Americans have long been accused of suffering selective amnesia about violence, purposely blotting out the savage history of this country and choosing instead to remember its reasonable moments. The history of the American student serves as a good example; amidst the current student turmoil, few remember that the period from the founding of the colonial colleges to the Civil War was one of continuous student rebellion. Motivated by a strong distaste for the close and petty disciplinary system. students at all types of schools revolted in a violent fashion which destroyed property and in more than a few cases resulted in the deaths of others. Even during this period, however, students could and did make specific demands, as when in the 1780's Harvard students requested and received the president's resignation. Two generations later, when another Harvard rebellion resulted in the expulsion of over half the senior class, the college president took advantage of the dissension to push through reforms in undergraduate organization.

While student rebellions and violence diminished abruptly after the Civil War, in response some felt to the athletic and extracurricular programs then developing, there had been earlier, less intimidating evidence of the students' influence on campus.

At a time in the eighteenth century when the colonial colleges were still dominated by Protestant dogma and the "collegiate way of living," the first true signs of an intellectual spirit came not from the faculty, but from the students. With the creation of the debating or literary societies, contemporary politics were brought to the campus, but more importantly, the enlightenment's faith in reason represented in analysis and debate were much more visible in the literary societies than in the classroom. Further, the sponsoring agency for speakers such as Ralph Waldo Emerson was invariably the student literary society, not the college; the college literary magazines were frequently products of the societies, and on more than a few campuses the largest and most diverse library was not the college's, but the literary society's. The popularity and influence of these societies is reflected in the changes they wrought in their colleges--a broadening of the classical curriculum and the eventual adopting by the colleges of many of the societies' critical functions.

These changes by the colleges, coupled with the rise of fraternities in the early nineteenth century, resulted in the decline of the literary societies. The fraternities, themselves, however, were not as much a reaction to the new-found intellectuality of the colleges, as much as a reaction to the continued dominance of piety and monotony in the college program. By attempting to fill the social and emotional vacuum existing in the colleges and by emphasizing manners, the fraternities prepared the students for the contemporary world rather than for the millennium. Their success was quick and widespread, again illustrating the means by which students will influence and change institutions dedicated to things as they are.

The cause of worldly virtues was also fought for in the development of athletics. Contemporary with the growth of fraternities was the growth of the outdoor gymnasium, and soon to follow it was

the development of crewing, baseball, and eventually football. In each case the students would find enthusiasm for a new sport or activity and the colleges would follow suit by providing the necessary facilities, and eventually the necessary coaches and physical education program. The influence of students on the university becomes clear when it is realized that no board of control or faculty decided to initiate fraternities or athletics.

While students built up the extracurriculum, the faculty retreated to their domain of the curriculum and attempted to maintain this area inviolate. But a tracing of student influence on the university would be incomplete without examining their influence on the curriculum as well. The first signs of this influence appeared as the student population at the beginning of the twentieth century changed. Larger numbers of students than ever before besieged the colleges, many of whom were little interested in the then prevalent scholarly ideal; as a consequence, many students became disappointed with their undergraduate programs, and dropped out. Further, the continued popularity and growth of the extracurriculum suggested the need for a reexamination of what was being taught. In consequence, the early twentieth century became an experimental laboratory for undergraduate curricula and spawned the Harvard tutorial system, the honors program at Swarthmore, Meiklejohn's "experimental college" at Wisconsin, the divisions at the University of Chicago, and the "Great Books" curriculum developed at Columbia. More specifically, the peace demonstrations, pacifism, anti-capitalism and general social protest of students in the 1930's provided a springboard for the progressive education movement which accepted John Dewey's classic statement that all learning first demanded an experience that interests the student. An early experiment in progressive learning at Antioch College was quickly followed by the establishment of Sarah Lawrence,

Bennington College and others. Today the protests made by students are facilitating and even forcing more rapid and extensive experimentation with all of the universities' curricula.

* * * * *

What is it that has characterized the governance pattern of American colleges and universities over the three and one-quarter centuries of their existence? Seemingly, it has been an authoritarian structure which existed in the earliest colleges and continues to manifest itself today, in which the critical decisions of the university community were made by a board of control in conjunction with the president, and from which the faculty and students have traditionally been excluded.

This authoritarian governance system has been continually eroded by many parties; first by the faculty who gained influence and power and eventually legitimacy in the decision-making process, and secondly by the alumni whose rise to influence and legitimacy has been rapid. Traditionally the students' legitimate role in decision making has been small. With notable exceptions student participation in governance has connoted self-government: control over dormitories, discipline procedures and honor systems. There has been great hesitancy to involve students in the major decision-making processes. Yet it would appear students have had a marked influence on American higher education, regardless of their lack of legitimate power; they have profoundly affected the curriculum and the extracurriculum. What they are now demanding, therefore, appears to be the right to influence the university in more positive and effective ways.

B. The Modern Context of Student-Faculty-Administrative Relationships

The contemporary context of student-faculty-administrative relationships is in a state of flux. Because some institutions are already experimenting with radical new forms of governance, while others are still in the stage of investigation, and still others are maintaining their present structures, it becomes difficult to state accurately what responsibilities and powers rest with each of the established sections of the university and which areas are in transition. Nonetheless, documents issued by organizations representing the various constituencies serve to bring some order to the scene by indicating areas of authority and responsibility agreed upon in the recent past. Such public statements can provide benchmarks by which to measure the demands of faculties and students. The statements used most extensively were: Academic Freedom and Civil Liberties of Students in Colleges and Universities (1965), Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities (1966), and the Student Bill of Rights or Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students (1967).

It should be noted that the necessity of drafting such public statements of rights and responsibilities, particularly for faculty and students, underscores the movement from privilege to right characteristic of the last century of higher education. As already indicated, the development of faculty rights came as a result of their professional development and growth of status, as well as the effective influence of the American Association of University Professors, and more recently faculty unions. The development of student rights has been more sudden and unexpected. It stems in part from the actions of several states following World War II to secure equality of access to higher education through legislation and the resulting tendency of courts to look upon educational opportunity as a right rather than a privilege.

In addition, the activities of college students as civil rights activists in the early sixties, aroused concern for the civil liberties of students. This concern has been extended to the disciplinary procedure on the campus where efforts to insure due process are under way. Finally the increasing tendency of students to take legal recourse in the face of university actions underscores the attempts to establish their "rights" in contrast to the early notion of privilege.

The Board of Control

Traditionally and legally, the board of control whether self-perpetuating private bodies or agents of the state have been defined as the final institutional authority. While delegating the conduct of administration to the administrative officers, the president and the deans, and the conduct of teaching and research to the faculty, the board generally retains responsibility for developing statements of overall policy and maintaining and directing the financial resources of the university. Finally the board serves as an active link between the university and its society or societies.

The President

The president, traditionally responsible for innovation and initiation, insures that operational standards and procedures conform to the policies of the board of control, acts as the chief spokesman for the institution, and has ultimate managerial responsibility for institutional activities. The real ability of the president of the modern university to innovate and initiate is constrained, however, and he must exercise his influence primarily through budgetary controls.

The Faculty

Faculty members as a body have traditionally possessed control over the curriculum, teaching and research, but in recent generations this control has been extended to authority over faculty status as well. Today this authority includes: academic appointments, reappointments, promotions, the granting of tenure and dismissals. The responsibility for the curriculum and teaching usually includes initiating new courses and programs, determining the teaching load, assigning course sections, and within specific departments authority over graduate students, financial aid and undergraduate majors. Although not given definite responsibility, it is assumed that faculty will have some specified influence over salary increases, on the selection of department heads, deans, and other executive officers. While administrative units or in some cases joint student-faculty-administrative units have been delegated responsibility for student discipline, the faculty usually possesses ultimate control over student discipline and the determination of student status as well.

Finally, within the American university system the faculty as individuals are almost sovereign with regard to course offerings. The professor generally is the final determiner of what is taught and discussed in his class.

Points of Contention. During the last half decade, there have been increasing actions and statements by university faculty members suggesting, requesting, and in some cases demanding, greater participation in university decision making. These statements have issued from the American Association of University Professors, the American Association of Higher Education, faculty groups representing various institutions, and from faculty unions.

Many of these statements concern community and state colleges, emerging universities, or private institutions where the governance pattern has tended to be autocratic and where faculty members have been slow to receive their professional rights. Most often these statements request such well-recognized privileges as a faculty senate or some influence in the choosing of deans. Further unrest exists however even in those public universities which have done most to involve faculty in decision making.

The rapid growth in higher education has led to an expanding hierarchy, the tendency toward a more pyramid-shaped organization with an accompanying centralization of budgeting. With few exceptions, this has meant that the president and board of control have authority over the raising and spending of funds. As a result, faculty members tend to have little influence other than consultation on the educationally relevant matters of capital funding, building programs, fund-raising, and tuition. Furthermore, in larger states which have developed significant networks of institutions of higher education, the inter-campus struggle for funds not only places faculties indirectly against each other, but also limits their communication and influence in the area of decision making. This problem is most notable in those states which possess "super boards"--coordinating agencies with powers to determine budgets, types of degrees offered, admissions, the location and size of new units, and the size of existing units in the system. Increasingly faculty members voice concern over the inability of a local faculty to influence these distant decision-making bodies. The representation of faculty interests by the president does not seem sufficient to many who argue for the direct participation of faculty members in the activities of these boards.

All of these concerns suggest a growing feeling among university faculties that their influence and hence authority over critical educational matters has significantly diminished.

Students

The students' rights and responsibilities in the university community have traditionally been both limited and obscure. The most significant advances made for securing student rights have dealt with individual liberties rather than with the power, authority, or influence of the body politic of students. The American Civil Liberties Union and the National Student Association have done much to establish the students' rights in the following areas: in the classroom, including freedom of expression, protection against improper academic evaluation, and protection against improper disclosure; in student affairs, including freedom of association and freedom of inquiry and expression; and in disciplinary proceedings with the right to due process.

As a group, students have generally had the authority or influence to help create the laws under which they live and have the authority to self-regulate student government, and student organizations, most notably, student publications. The responsibilities and authority of students in the large area of institutional policy have been vague if not non-existent. The most recent allusion to their right of influence in this area was made in the Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students: "The student body should have clearly defined means to participate in the formulation and application of institutional policy affecting academic and student affairs." It is to be noted that the groups sponsoring this statement achieved no consensus on what the methods of student participation should be.

Points of Contention. The lack of established methods of participation in formulating institutional policy has not prevented students from influencing policy by every means from peaceful protest to physical disruption. In an effort to establish more orderly participation in the decision-making process, however, experiments are increasingly taking shape. These have ranged from directly involving students on boards of control to involvement in faculty senate, to departmental involvement on virtually all aspects of institutional policy.

A recent survey of student protest during the period of September 1967-June 1968 indicates that while demand for participation in institutional policy making has been a significant source of unrest, more significant have been protests against established policies. Indeed, a certain segment of the student population would refuse to participate in university decision making, since participation in such a "corrupt" system would lead to the "self-corruption" of the student. An even larger segment of the student population would decline to participate because it is not interested. Nonetheless, an extrapolation of the recent data on student protest would suggest certain broad areas, in addition to those already delegated, in which activist students demand participation. The first of these deals with decisions affecting the universities' boundary relationship with the larger society, specifically with services performed for that society: on-campus recruiting; draft records; ROTC; and classified defense and related research. A related concern are those decisions affecting the universities' relationship with its more immediate society: its effect and impact on the poor, particularly; the relation of the university to local merchants; and the relation to local landlords. In the area of academic decisions, students have protested for the right to help determine the hiring, promoting, and tenure of faculty. They have also demanded the right to help determine the content of the curriculum, most notably in the area of black studies. Finally, the right of determining who shall be educated, the essential requirements of admission to the university, has been questioned.

* * * * *

In summary, both students and faculty are pressing into areas of responsibility and authority traditionally held by others. The faculty is demanding involvement in the critical area of centralized budgeting and desires direct access and involvement in the rapidly developing bureaucracy

of higher education. The students wish direct involvement in broad institutional policies such as those affecting the university's posture and response to its various communities. In addition they wish a greater opportunity to pass on the academic environment in which they learn: on the faculty and on the curriculum.

These pressures on university organization suggest a movement away from the current pyramidic character of university organization, a structure combining bureaucratic and collegial elements, toward an ideal of governance which is more egalitarian.

PART II

THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS WITH RESPECT TO STUDENT-FACULTY-ADMINISTRATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

A. Theoretical Considerations

Universities have continually resisted the efforts of those who would analyze the academic community with concepts derived from other types of organizations. Always it has been claimed that the university is unique both in purpose and structure; any attempt to gain insights by comparing it to a business organization, for example, would prove both futile and misleading.

But the changes in universities during the last quarter of a century make such analogies seem more reasonable. Furthermore, a significant amount of worthwhile research has been conducted in universities employing organizational concepts. Finally, the types of governance problems now being encountered in universities have long been studied in other types of organizations. For these reasons, the following section will discuss organizational theory, with the intent of offering some fresh insights into governance problems.

Organizational Theory

Traditional types of formal organization have been based on a mechanical model which assumed that organizational effectiveness and efficiency required a set arrangement of parts with specified functions and operations. Once designed, such an organization, like a machine, would run itself, requiring only the occasional replacement of a standardized part. The critical concern was with a precise, logical, internal structure; a bureaucracy therefore required

specialization of tasks, standardization of task performance, line control, and centralization of decision making, uniformity of rules, and no repetition of function.

By avoiding conflict through depersonalization it was felt that maximum efficiency could be maintained. However, a significant amount of research in this country hinted at the existence, in addition to the formal organization, of an informal organization. This organization revolved around the employee's status level, his friendship groups, the meaningfulness of his job--in essence, his personal motivations. These factors were found to have a significant impact on the organization's effectiveness and also its efficiency. Thus a theory of "social organizations" developed.

Contemporary writers have continued to expand organizational theory by indicating the manner in which organizations are affected by their environment. An organic or "open systems" model has been postulated which assumes that social organizations, like living systems, must import energy or resources from their environment in order to maintain themselves. Such an interaction model reveals possible weaknesses in a rigid or static internal structure, since this very rigidity would inhibit the organization's ability to cope with a changing environment. The new model revealed the need to view a social organization as a system of relationships which maintains a dynamic equilibrium as it adjusts to new situations. The bureaucratic structure of the American military, for example, proved remarkably efficient while dealing with simple tasks under relatively static social conditions. But rapid changes in technology following World War II, and more recent changes in public attitudes and values, have posed significant challenges to the maintenance of the traditional line control.

Therefore, organizational theorists have become critically interested in those factors, both social and structural, which enable a social organization to cope with rapidly changing conditions,

which help provide solutions to increasingly complex problems, and which assist in the management of conflict. The organization characteristics which seem to relate to these adaptive processes include: a marked degree of common interest among the organization members, a high amount of interaction and influence, both upward and downward communication, autonomy and responsibility for individuals at the lower ends of the organizational hierarchy, and a generally high amount of influence spread throughout the hierarchy of the organization.

This last characteristic is not immediately comprehensible, since our normal expectations of social organization tend to be governed by a closed-system model. Common sense would suggest that there is a limited amount of influence in any organization, that the gain of influence by one group would necessitate the loss of influence by another--what is frequently called a "zero-sums game." Current research based on an "open systems" model, however, indicates the total amount of influence in a social organization may grow, benefiting several parts of the hierarchy at the same time. Such an increase in influence may occur, in one instance, when an organization expands into its external environment; the modern university for example possesses much greater influence in its society than did the hill-top college of the nineteenth century.

The University Community

But how does the university community measure on these organization characteristics? Contemporary accounts of the university describe it as a fractured community in which the various groups have little contact with each other, and in which the largest group, the students, feel alienated from the sources of power. Furthermore, there is limited belief in the authority of the organizational unit charged with maintaining the institution, the administration. These allegations bear substance. The demands on the time of important administrators are enormous. Moreover, since the rewards for most university ad-

ministrators are to be found in promotion within their system, their time, influence, and interactions are largely confined to their peers and superiors. Opportunities for involvement with faculty and students diminish to the extent that the administrator must continually depend on his colleagues for information, thus narrowing the focus of the communications he receives about the institution.

Similarly, faculty are a separate element in the university, pursuing their career-oriented goals partly through the medium of publication; as a consequence their participation and involvement in governance processes, and in interaction with students and administrators, declines. Nevertheless, the traditional tendency for the professional in a voluntary organization to distrust the authority of the bureaucrat is reflected in the faculty's frequent repudiation of the administration.

Finally, while the students' goals and interests are less clear, it is obvious that large numbers of them no longer seek the role of professional scholar, a role which has for a significant period identified them with faculty interest. Therefore, unlike the administrators and faculty, the student may be less likely to seek goals readily realizable within the institution, and for this reason may appear less committed to it. This places him in opposition to both faculty and administrators, a fact underscored by some contemporary students' tendency to repudiate both faculty and administration and their attempt to form an identifiably distinct group.

In terms of the organizational characteristics previously mentioned one would rate the university community quite low. Formal as well as informal interaction and influence are relatively low, communication among the different parties is difficult, groups tend to pursue self-interests which effectively oppose the possibility of binding mutual interests, influence is disproportionately spread throughout the hierarchy, and the students' authority and responsibility are low.

Implication for Changes in Governance

To the extent that organizational theorists have accurately portrayed those characteristics of social organizations which assist them in adjusting to the environment and in helping to reduce conflict, universities will have to make major changes if they are to benefit from the analysis. The theory would suggest, for instance:

A movement toward a more egalitarian definition of citizenship in the academic community.

An attempt to increase the total amount of organizational influence across all levels of the hierarchy. This could perhaps be accomplished by:

1. developing long-term planning in an attempt to gain influence over decisions affecting future developments;

2. shifting downward authority and responsibility all along the line; more specifically, it would mean increasing the meaningful authority and responsibility of those at the lowest end of the influence curve, the students, the teaching assistants, etc.;

3. movement toward greater interaction and influence through overlapping organizational groups.

The development of a systematic procedure for communicating upward as well as downward.

Opening up closed circuits of communication to all members of the community.

An attempt to use group decision making wherever possible.

Developing a team to substitute for or augment critical one-man positions.

The changing of any social organization to a more participative and collaborative form is a slow and frequently a painful process requiring extensive training and patience. It cannot be quickly accomplished without endangering the psychological health of the institution or without sacrificing whatever gains might be made. For this reason the contemporary tendency to make significant changes in organization structure out of fear or in an attempt to end conflict with a minimum of effort may damage significantly the possibilities for a more adaptive form of governance. Every attempt must be made not to destroy the academic community in a misinformed effort to save it.

B. Practical Considerations to be Resolved

Despite the current interest in and demand for reform of academic government, there are grave practical difficulties which must be surmounted. Those who would reform academia must first be sure that they understand it. Indeed, much of the problem is that there is no "it," for the approximately 2,000 American institutions of higher learning spread their governmental patterns over an incredible spectrum.

There are, of course, public and private colleges and universities, but within each broad category there is infinite variety. The public sector has its multiversity, handling great numbers of students, but also with heavy emphasis on research, and a high proportion of graduate students. The echelon of former state colleges, often interested primarily in teacher training, are now diversified and have become universities, but with considerably less research and many fewer graduate students. The junior colleges increasingly absorb those students in their first two years, but many are pursuing a terminal two-year program, and in any event most, if not all, are commuters who are present on campus mostly for class and associated library work. Technical schools present still another variation. Then there are the states which long have had wholly or predominantly Negro public institutions, often run on a particularly authoritarian model.

Within the private sector there is equal variety. Here too one finds the multiversity, largely supported with public funds. But there are fewer students, they are more highly selected, and graduates represent a high proportion of the total. Alongside these universities come many of the small liberal arts colleges, often with an elitist tradition and ancient forms of government and support. To the picture must be added the many small (and sometimes large) colleges and universities supported by religious denominations. And finally there are the colleges started in recent years with the frank motive of making a profit.

Given this spectrum of institutions it is hardly necessary to amplify the conclusion that no single form of government can be expected to satisfy the needs, traditions and demands of the community and its supporters at all institutions.

As if the variety of institutions were not enough, any inquiry into academic government must take into consideration the fact that relevant decisions are made at very different levels. It is the department, for instance, which typically hires and fires faculty members, decides what courses will be offered, decides who will teach what, makes the policy decisions about how to use teaching assistants, recommends salary increases, and provides the individual advisors for graduate students. It is the college which decides upon priorities within the college, allocates the total college budget, decides upon degree requirements, establishes a grading policy, and handles many student discipline problems. Finally, it is the central administration which sets overall priorities (after receiving the requirements of the colleges), which allocates the budget among the colleges, which accepts the primary responsibility for raising money, and which sets most of the major policies with respect to the external world. It also makes important money decisions, on such things as tuition, housing costs within university-owned facilities, and special fee assessments.

Apart from the academic structure, all colleges and universities have various service enterprises which frequently have separate management systems. Students often are in charge of many student services, while athletic, health care and housing systems employ a variety of governmental systems.

Since the utilization of many different decision-making bodies decentralizes the total process, it has long been supposed to bring the mechanism closer to those who are most concerned with the end result. Because such a rationale fits in with the current demand for participation in decisions which affect one, and because the traditions which favor this method are frequently both ancient and ingrained, it is improbable that any type of reform will change in the direction of more centralization.

Despite the difficulties to academic reform which are posed by the infinite variety of existing models, and despite the diversified pattern of decision making with respect to those items which interest members of the academic community, one can say with a fair degree of confidence that such difficulties could be overcome. A more serious problem is posed by the inefficiency and/or obsolescence and/or unrepresentative character of far too many faculty and student organizations. The hard fact is that they often present a deplorable case for the kind of involvement which their most activist members desire. Faculty meetings are frequently so badly attended that a quorum is not available to act on items of business. Only crises or salary complaints tend to produce a sizable membership meeting. An organized minority can frequently dominate or manipulate the body. It is a cliché around campuses that issues on the faculty agenda tend to be decided by the primary interest group, which makes a point of herding its members to the meeting while the mass of indifferent or "too busy" members remain away.

Student governments suffer from the same deficiencies. The total vote is usually in the neighborhood of one-fourth of the eligible voters. Students in many of the professional colleges take no

interest at all, though they, and the graduate students, may be more than half of the total student body. Close observation reveals that many of the colleges within a university draw more student interest with respect to the governments of their own colleges than with the central body. Activists, who will expend time and energy on the governmental process, find it relatively easy to manipulate the structure.

Genuine efforts are being made to resolve some of these problems in faculty and student government on many campuses. For example, representative bodies are elected in some large schools. But campus elections, whether they involve faculty or students, represent the democratic process imperfectly, because they lack the accompanying features, such as a party system, which make a democracy work. It is probably inevitable therefore that only a few will participate; that the ruling group will always constitute an oligarchy. Moreover, there may be large and unrepresented constituencies, such as teaching assistants or research people without faculty appointments.

There is another not very well understood problem with respect to faculty and student participation in the decision-making process. The assumption that the mere involvement of faculty and student members on decision-making bodies will give the mass of students and faculty a sense of participation is frequently unfounded. Faculty and student members can be just as remote from their colleagues as are the administrators with whom the process started, and there may be no more opportunity to communicate with them than previously existed. Indeed, one of the wry observations which one can make on faculty participation is that the faculty member no sooner becomes genuinely involved than he feels it necessary to ask for a lighter academic load so that he may keep up with his administrative work. Since many, if not most, academic administrators are former professors, it may then be difficult to explain how it is that the professor, who now must be given released time to keep up with his administrative load, is different from the full-time administrator who was also formerly a professor.

Finally, there is the special reeducation problem which cannot be avoided if there is to be both faculty and student involvement in decision making within universities. Aside from the turnover in faculties, which demands change in participating members, there is the fact that the faculty member normally does not wish to accept administrative assignments for any lengthy period of time because they interfere with his teaching and research. Thus about the time he becomes most valuable, in terms of his knowledge of the problems involved, he leaves the committee to be replaced by another colleague. The problem is even more intense on the student side since there is a guaranteed turnover.

PART III

SOME EMERGING MODELS OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT

Out of the turmoil of the last few years one can see emerging at least three models of college-university government which are designed to meet the pressures of the time.

This is not to suggest that there has been an overnight revolution in college-university government, for the administration of a great many institutions remains both undisturbed and unperturbed. But it does mean that times are changing and that there is a groping for new and better solutions to old problems, as well as some that are new.

The three emerging models mentioned above might be labeled: (1) The Academic Community, (2) The Independent Constituency, and (3) The City Council. The characteristics of each can be stated briefly.

A. The Academic Community

The term most commonly used in discussions of college-university government today is "community." It means the participation by all interested groups in the decision-making processes so that the "true purposes" of the university are upheld. Such a technique requires agreement upon common goals, and this is difficult in today's large and complex universities because there admittedly are conflicts in interest among the constituencies. It may be, therefore, that the "community" approach can be applied at the departmental level, or even the college level, but not at the central administrative level.

In establishing the "community" some rather serious difficulties are encountered. One must decide, for instance, who the interested parties are

and how they are to share in the governance process. W. H. Cowley, a historian of higher education, has suggested that there are at least nine constituencies which are entitled to be involved in the college-university decision-making process. They are: the civil government or state, the trustees or agents of civil government, the administration, the various faculties, the students, the alumni, the protective societies, and the general public. To these groups could also be added the large number of nonacademic employees.

A "community" which involves all of the above constituencies is obviously unwieldy. Moreover, it leads to two other problems. The first is the question of the relative interest of each of the constituencies, i.e., their comparative numbers, and the second is whether there are such things as "primary" and "secondary" interests. Students, for example, frequently insist that only students may pass on questions which are of "primary" interest to students. If this is so, it follows that only faculty can pass on questions which are of "primary" interest to them. Followed to its logical conclusion this approach is fruitless because it leads away from, not towards, the community. Nevertheless, even the strongest advocates of the "community" approach often suggest that participation by all of the constituencies in the decision-making process does not mean that they participate equally. Faculty are extremely reluctant to involve students in the hiring and firing process, and certainly not in the sense of equal voting rights. Both would probably resist the inclusion of those outside the faculty-student ranks in such questions.

Viewed from the standpoint of the student activist there is another difficulty with the "community" approach. Almost certainly the other members of the community are going to be more conservative than he is. By joining with them in a democratic procedure which then arrives at conclusions which he is not prepared to accept, he has painted himself into a corner. Decisions are legitimized by his participation, yet they do not represent his position.

A final problem with the "community" approach is that it does not circumvent the governing board of the institution. In public institutions this board is established by law and is not readily changeable in makeup or power. Thus there remains a potential veto over the acts of the community decision-making process.

Despite these problems, there is strong emotional appeal in the "community" approach, and it is being tried in various institutions. Individual departments, even colleges, can and do experiment with various adaptations of the idea. This is encouraging, for there is no inherent reason to avoid the "community" approach, and it offers the possibility of greater mutual satisfaction, greater participation, and perhaps more readiness to change old ways.

B. The Independent Constituency

The independent constituency approach is almost the exact opposite of the "community" idea. It accepts the fact that there are strong conflicts within the college-university body, and proceeds to organize each separately and to bargain for the interests of the particular group. Thus the nonacademic employees join unions, the faculty joins an educational association like the AAUP, or a union, the students organize locally and perhaps nationally, the alumni have their association, the community and governmental interests work through their representatives and each maximizes his own position.

So stated this makes each of the interests sound selfish, unmindful of the larger interest, and committed only to its own welfare. This need not be the case, though it certainly can be. It is, in fact, the way much of the larger society is organized. It is also the way many colleges and universities now operate, except that the individual constituencies are not presently as powerful as they can be, and perhaps will be, as time passes.

The independent constituency approach avoids problems of who the interested parties are, how they shall be represented, and what constituencies have "primary" as compared with "secondary" interests. It frankly concentrates on those items which are of particular interest to the individual constituency. Nonacademic employees do not participate in academic matters, but they do show great interest in wages, hours and working conditions which affect them. In doing so they may demand and receive a larger share of the total budget than in the past. Faculty members center their attention on academic problems, giving students both more freedom to handle issues related to their personal lives, and perhaps less participation in how the educational process is conducted. Students focus on those items which are of primary interest to them, largely outside the classroom. An uneasy peace naturally exists, for the boundaries of the various constituencies are not clean and sharp, and there will be inevitable disputes over "jurisdiction."

In such a situation the administration is left to deal with each of the constituencies, hopefully in ways which keep them compatible. This is not so different from what an administration does now, except that the constituencies are not as well organized as they might be.

There are some elements of consolation from the administration's standpoint. Written agreements frequently protect the "management prerogative" so that the rules of the game are known, and in such a bargaining context the understanding is that the administration will act and the constituencies react. Thus the initiative remains with the administration. In some cases, impartial tribunals can be devised to resolve disputes with the various constituencies, though not all questions are likely to be subject to such a procedure.

In many ways, we are already well down this path in American college-university circles. Certainly nonacademic employees are increasingly

organized, and are likely to be reluctant to give up such organizations in return for participation in a broader community process which may produce less for them in the way of material benefits. Faculty members likewise have their own organizations and may well prefer to keep and/or develop them further, rather than participate in a more nebulous "community" process. Students in Western European countries have long had student unions which are capable of exerting substantial pressure on individual or collective administrative bodies.

The individual constituency approach raises no problem so far as the governing board is concerned, because it simply accepts and recognizes the board. The question is one of bargaining power, not legal rights.

C. The City Council Model

What is here labeled the "city council" model is something between the "community" and the "individual constituency." It does not attempt to devise a legislative or executive body which involves all the interested constituencies, but it does make it possible for them to be heard right up to and including the board of control. The administration is chosen in the first place through a selection process which includes the board of control, the faculty, the students, and perhaps others. At the various levels of administration advisory committees are used so that the constituencies know of and participate in the formulation of policy. Key questions, especially those which are controversial, are presented to the board of control in an open hearing, with the various constituencies invited to appear and argue for their respective positions. The board in control is itself selected through some process in which all the interested constituencies participate.

The end result is something which looks like a city council form of government. That is, the governing board (city council) is elected, the administration is chosen through a process which not

only permits but requires participation by the involved constituencies, issues of "public" concern are argued openly and with a full opportunity in those who disagree to appear and make known their positions.

The one element which is officially lacking is a limited term for the administration. Even this could be added. Indeed, there are those who have suggested that all administrators should have fixed terms, subject to renewal. This is already done in some institutions up through the dean level. It could be extended to the very top. It can, of course, be argued that the top administration (particularly the president) is already like the prime minister. He cannot remain in power once he loses the confidence of his constituents, and the events of recent years have shown how vulnerable administrators are to their various publics.

The "city council" form of government which one sees emerging in some universities retains the initiative in the administration and probably leaves it more flexible than either the "community" or "individual constituency" approaches. It involves less participation in the legal sense than in the community system. It softens the sharp divisiveness of the individual constituency model. It is, however, compatible with both, assuming one of the other systems is practiced at a lower level of decision making within the system.

In point of fact, there is probably no institution which has a pure model of any of the three typologies suggested above. Given the decentralization which exists in many institutions, departments and colleges have felt relatively free to experiment and have therefore come up with different answers. It is at the central level where many, but not all, of the important decisions are made that there is a need for new answers.

PART IV

CONCLUSION

It has not been the purpose of this report to prescribe a form of college-university government which would meet the needs of any and all institutions. On the contrary, it has attempted to emphasize the great variety of institutions with differing traditions, the complexity of government within the academic community, the contribution of organizational theory, some practical obstacles, and finally some emerging forms of governmental practice.

If the report is useful, it will be because it supplies perspective and perhaps some different ways of viewing old problems.

It is the intention of the Committee to follow this report with another one which examines in closer detail some specific examples of college-university government. Perhaps such a report will flesh out some of the general background supplied in this paper, and make it easier for the reader to decide which, if any, of the models best applies to his particular situation.